



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 08-05

Paper No: \_\_\_\_

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
SUITE 700  
1667 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20006

**COPY MAILED**  
AUG 05 2005  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Udd : **DECISION ON PETITION**  
Application No. 09/893,440 :  
Filed: 29 June, 2001 :  
Attorney Docket No. HAR 66 013 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 27 July, 2005, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and §1.137(b) to revive the application as abandoned due to unavoidable delay, and as a request to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 C.F.R. §1.181.

NOTE: Docketing of Status Inquiries at six- (6-) month intervals following the filing of papers/replies may be prudent practice to demonstrate diligence when lengthy delays occur in matters such as this.

For the reasons set forth below the petition under 37 C.F.R.:

- §1.181 is **GRANTED**; and
- §1.137(a) and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are **DISMISSED as moot**.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action, mailed on 30 July, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before Monday, 1 November, 2004;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 30 October, 2004;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 15 June, 2005;
- Petitioner responds that:
  - 30 July, 2004, Office action was not received by his office;
  - a review of docketing materials show no evidence of receipt of the 30 July, 2004, Office action (a description of the procedures is provided); and
  - Petitioner evidences with a receipt card (see: MPEP §503<sup>1</sup>), that

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP §503 provides in pertinent part:  
§503 Application Number and Filing Receipt

\* \* \*

A return postcard should be attached to *each* patent application for which a receipt is desired. It is important that the return postcard itemize all of the components of the application. If the postcard does not itemize each of the components of the application, it will not serve as evidence that any component which was not itemized was received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). It should be recognized that the identification of an application by application number does not necessarily signify that the USPTO has accepted the application as complete (37 C.F.R. §1.53(a)).

\* \* \*

#### RETURN POSTCARD

If a receipt of any item (e.g., paper or fee) filed in the USPTO is desired, it may be obtained by enclosing with the paper a self-addressed postcard specifically identifying the item. The USPTO will stamp the receipt date on the postcard and place it in the outgoing mail. A postcard receipt which itemizes and properly identifies the items which are being filed serves as *prima facie* evidence of receipt in the USPTO of all the items listed thereon on the date stamped thereon by the USPTO.

The identifying data on the postcard should be so complete as to clearly identify the item for which receipt is requested. For example, the postcard should identify the applicant's name, application number (if known), confirmation number (if known), filing date, interference number, title of the invention, etc. The postcard should also identify the type of paper being filed, e.g., new application, affidavit, amendment, notice of appeal, appeal brief, drawings, fees, motions, supplemental oath or declaration, petition, etc., and the number of pages being submitted. If a new application is being filed, all parts of the application being submitted should be separately listed on the postcard, e.g., the number of pages of specification (including written description, claims and abstract), number of claims, number of sheets of drawings, number of pages of oath/declaration, number of pages of cover sheet (provisional application).

The postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of any item which is not adequately itemized on the postcard. For example, merely listing on the postcard "a complete application" or "patent application" will not serve as a proper receipt for each of the required components of an application (e.g., specification (including claims), drawings (if necessary), oath or declaration and the application filing fee) or missing portions (e.g., pages, sheets of drawings) of an application if one of the components or portion of a component is found to be missing by the USPTO. Each separate component should be specifically and properly itemized on the postcard. Furthermore, merely incorporating by reference in the postcard receipt, the items listed in a transmittal letter will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of those items.

The person receiving the item(s) in the USPTO will check the listing on the postcard against the item(s) being filed to be sure they are properly identified and that all the items listed on the postcard are presently being submitted to the USPTO. If any of the items listed on the postcard are not being submitted to the USPTO, those items will be crossed off and the post-card initialed by the person receiving the items. Upon return of a postcard receipt from the USPTO, the postcard receipt should be promptly reviewed by the person who filed the items to ensure that every item specifically denoted on the postcard was received by the USPTO. If the postcard receipt has been annotated to indicate that a particular item denoted on the postcard was not received by the USPTO, the postcard receipt will not serve as *prima facie* evidence of receipt of that item in the USPTO. (Emphasis supplied.)

he Noticed the Office on 5 September, 2002, of a Change of Address, which apparently was not incorporated into Office records because the 30 July, 2004, Office action was mailed to the old address;

- Petitioner submits docketing documents suggesting the non-receipt and points to Office records evidencing that the 30 July, 2004, Office action was mailed to the old—and incorrect—address.

**As of this writing, Office records have been updated to reflect Petitioner's new correspondence address.**

Petitioner has filed an Amendment as the reply to the 30 July, 2004, non-final Office action.

#### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>2</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>3</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>4</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>4</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>6</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>7</sup>))

As to a Request to Withdraw  
the Holding of Abandonment

The courts have determined the construct for properly supporting a petition seeking withdrawal of a holding of abandonment.<sup>8</sup> (See: the commentary set forth at MPEP §711.03(c).)

Petitioner has satisfied the showing required under Delgar and thus to be considered under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.181.

As to Allegations  
of Unavoidable Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) are the petition and fee, a showing of unavoidable delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed before 8 June, 1995.

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is moot.

As to Allegations  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a showing/statement of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed before 8 June, 1995.

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

<sup>7</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>8</sup> See: Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971).

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is moot.

CONCLUSION

The petition(s) under 37 C.F.R.:

- §1.181 is **granted**, the petition fee (\$1,500.00) and the unnecessary fee paid for an extension of time (\$1,020.00) will be refunded, and the 15 June Notice of Abandonment is **vacated**; and
- under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and §1.137(b) are **dismissed as moot** and the petition fee refunded .

The instant file is released to Technology Center 2800 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions